

ACTION TAKEN
On The
DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS
of 7 March 1952

ACTION TAKEN On The DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Of 7 March 1952

(See Reference b.)

Action

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. a. Eliminate the proposed statement of policy, to be signed by the DEI. | Accomplished |
| b. Substitute a directive, appointing the CIA Career Service Board. | Accomplished |
| c. Add functions listed in Paragraph 8. (See Paragraph 8, below) | |
| 2. a. Provide separate programs for the following classes of personnel: (1) clerical & administrative, (2) specialists and (3) professionals. | (Accomplished, See Para. 9.a., below) |
| 3. a. Eliminate from the Personnel Evaluation Report the provision that subject should sign the report signifying that he has seen all the comments of his supervisor. | Accomplished |
| 4. a. The program should apply from the time of entering the service. | Accomplished |
| b. It should determine the system of selection, training, promotion and rewards. | Accomplished |
| c. Eliminate written agreement of intent to make a career in CIA, together with security concurrences. | Accomplished |
| 5. a. Eliminate concept of tenure. | Accomplished |
| 6. a. Eliminate hazardous-duty pay as part of Career Service benefits. | Accomplished |
| b. Limit meritorious award system to the clerical and administrative class and to the specialist class. | (See Para. 9.b., below) |

Tab B

- c. Eliminate special compensation to dependents of persons engaged in hazardous duty who are themselves exposed to hazard. Accomplished
- d. Eliminate death gratuities to dependents of overseas personnel. Accomplished
- e. Retain proposals for revival of Missing Persons Act. Accomplished
- f. Retain proposals for more liberal retirement system. No Action
- g. Retain proposals for adequate leave system for overseas personnel. No Action
- 7. a. Questions regarding rotation. Answered
(See Tab II)
- 8. a. The CIA Career Service Board to act as rating board for all Assistant Directors and Deputy Assistant Directors. (See Para. 9.c., below)
- b. In an Office Board, the Assistant Director, Deputy Assistant Director and one of the Division Chiefs to act as rating board for other Division Chiefs. (See Para. 9.c., below)
- c. One officer below grade of Division Chief to be added to each Office Board. (Accomplished, See Para. 9.d., below)
- d. Each Office Board to include a member of another Office. (Accomplished, See Para. 9.e., below)

9. Discussion

- a. Regarding 2.a., above. - Provide separate programs for the following classes of personnel: (1) clerical and administrative, (2) specialists and (3) professionals.

The Committee believes that the proposed program carries out your intent, since individual development programs will fall in the three main groupings which you have recommended.

Based on two exploratory studies, however, the Committee has not attempted to draw a sharp line of demarcation between each of the three groups and to assign and label each person as a member of one of the three groups. The first study, prepared for and transmitted to the Inspector General on 7 March at his request, showed an analysis of CIA strength as of 1 March 1952, according to the three categories, (1) clerical and administrative, (2) specialists and (3) professionals. No adequate definitions or criteria of these categories were available nor was the Committee able to develop any that were satisfactory. The result was an arbitrary lumping of functions into three large, heterogeneous, artificial classes that would not serve the purposes which it is believed you have in mind. Another later attempt produced a functional analysis of positions in CIA which showed, among other things, that there were seven major categories to which the 551 main types of jobs in CIA could be assigned but that there were within each of the seven categories several legitimate job families. Again, it was thought that such a set-up would not produce the results which the Committee believed you desire.

There is a trend in the government to reduce or eliminate categories and boundaries between classes of personnel and a corresponding trend to unify services to the greatest extent possible. The current efforts of the Department of State to put into effect the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and of the Rowe Committee in order to "move toward the ultimate objective of a fully integrated service", is a case in point. The action of Congress in 1949 of eliminating, after 25 years' use, three services (GAF series, SP series, and P series) and combining them into one General Schedule (GS series) is another.

Studies by the Civil Service Commission have shown that where individuals participating in essentially the same activity in the same physical environs are grouped in different classes, borderline cases and problems rise in proportion to median cases and tension, morale problems and administrative difficulties result.

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/03/28 : CIA-RDP78-04718A000400050057-2

Security Information

It is, of course, true that clerical functions, specialist functions and professional functions exist, in a broad sense, and that it is valid to label a job as such. In fact, the wage and classification techniques now carried out in the Agency are based on that concept. It is a different matter, however, to label a person as belonging to a clerical, specialist or professional class. It is believed that desired flexibility in the assignment of persons to specific positions and the career development of those persons will be enhanced if the Office Career Service Boards are free to plan their careers solely in terms of their development needs in response to the needs of the Agency without having to give consideration to the class to which the individual might have been assigned.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends that, for the time being, only one class of personnel be formally recognized.

- b. Regarding to 6.b., above. - Limit the meritorious award system to the clerical and administrative class and to the specialist class.

The Committee feels that the fundamental principles underlying the desirability of an awards program applicable to specialists and to clerical and administrative personnel are equally applicable, if not more so, to professionals. It also feels that there should be an internal system of awards to recognize outstanding achievement or professional attainment, particularly in CIA where professional personnel generally are forced into a role of anonymity insofar as brother professionals are concerned, including the public. We are not aware of any awards program in the Government which denies participation to "professionals" or "officers".

and the full support of the whole group
Accordingly, the Committee recommends that all CIA personnel be accorded the opportunity to participate in the CIA awards program and be eligible for any CIA honor award.

- c. Regarding 8.a. and b., above. - The CIA Career Service Board to act as rating board for all Assistant Directors and Deputy Assistant Directors. In an Office Board, the Assistant Director, the Deputy Assistant Director and one of the Division Chiefs to act as rating board for other Division Chiefs.

The Committee has adhered to the principle that it is the responsibility of the supervisor to evaluate his subordinates. The supervisor's evaluation would be reviewed by an appropriate superior officer, also in the direct chain of command in order

SECRET
Security Information

to eliminate or correct conscious or unconscious bias on the part of the supervisor. The Committee believes that the top Board and the Office Boards should have available to them for planning purposes the reviewed evaluations but that the Boards should not enter the line of command between superior and subordinate.

- d. Regarding 3.c., above. - One officer below the grade of Division Chief to be added to the Office Board.

The Committee believes that this matter should be optional with the Office concerned and that CIA is not yet ready for widespread application of the principles of "multiple management". It also feels that an Office Board should have as much stature as possible and be as close to the top echelon as possible in order to carry out its responsibilities.

- e. Regarding 3.d., above. - Each Office Board to include a member of another Office.

The Committee feels that this matter should also be optional with each Office. Each Office Board should consider it desirable to call in whatever consultants are necessary. Since such Boards will be concerned with internal Office matters, the Committee does not feel that formal membership on a Board by other than its own Office's personnel is desirable.